

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 1-3, 6-10, 12-17, 25-27, 30-34, 36-40, and 50 are currently pending and subject to examination. By the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 10, 12, 17, 25, 34, 36, 41, and 50 have been amended. Claims 18-22 and 42-46 were previously withdrawn. Claims 4, 5, 11, 23-24, 28-29, 35, 47-49, and 51-53 were previously canceled. No new matter has been added.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-17, 28, 30-34, 36-41, and 50-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 11-3, 6-10, 12-17, 25-27, 30-34, 36-40, and 50 have been amended. The Applicants note that the claim amendments are supported at least by the description on page 55, line 18 – page 56, line 16 and Figures 30a-30f. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. If any further amendment is required, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned representative.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action mailed January 23, 2008, claims 1-2, 6, 8-10, 17, 25-26, 28, 30-34, and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,298,441 to Handelman et al. (“Handelman”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,195,667 to Duga et al. (“Duga”), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,890,177 to Moody et al. (“Moody”) and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,778,374 to Dang et al. (“Dang”). Claims 3 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Handelman in view of Duga in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,654,754 to Knauff et al. ("Knauff") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,892,900 to Ginter ("Ginter") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,675,384 to Block et al. ("Block"). Claim 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,761,681 to Huffman et al. ("Huffman") in view of Handelman, Moody, and Duga. Claims 12-16 and 36-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Handelman in view of Duga, further in view of Moody, Dang, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,249,785 to Paepke and U.S. Patent No. 6,279,017 to Walker. It is noted that claims 1-3, 6-10, 12-17, 25-27, 30-34, 36-40, and 50 have been amended. To the extent that the rejections remain applicable to the claims currently pending, the Applicant hereby traverses the rejection, as follows.

a. Independent Claims 1, 10, 12, 17, 25, 34, 36, and 41

The Applicant respectfully submits that nothing in the cited prior art, taken alone or in combination (propriety of which is not admitted), discloses or suggests a method for restricting access to electronic books displayed on a viewer that comprises at least the combination of features of determining at the viewer if the user is authorized to restrict access to the electronic books, if the user is authorized, saving an unrestricted version of the electronic book in at least one of the library unit and the viewer, the unrestricted version including the original format of the electronic book, creating a restricted version and saving the restricted version of the electronic book in at least one of the library unit and the viewer, the restricted version including content from the original format of the electronic book and having portions of the original content deleted without changing the original format of the electronic book, the deletions based on the

identification of restricted content from the user, and inserting a cross-reference to the restricted version of the electronic book in a header portion of the unrestricted version of the electronic book, as recited in amended claim 1.

In Handelman, a “document is typically received in several versions” and “conditional access information might include language control information, controlling what language version or versions are available or preferred for display.” See Handelman at column 17, lines 27-38. Handelman also describes restrictions “a restriction allowing a portion of the document to be viewed or only allowing the document to be viewed in a certain format, such restrictions being based typically on parental control limits.” See Handelman at column 18, lines 30-35. In addition, the restriction version in Handelman is saved in a removable information storage smart card. See Handelman at col. 18, line 23-25 and Fig. 15. Indeed, Handelman teaches that typically various versions of a document are received, rather than presenting features allowing a user to create and store their own unrestricted version with personally selected deleted content.

The Examiner alleged that Duga discloses receiving and updating directory data of the electronic books in a library unit, that Moody discloses receiving at a viewer/computer an identification of restricted content from the user and that deletions from a document are based on the identification of restricted content from the user, and that Dang discloses a cross-reference to the unrestricted version of the electronic book in a header portion of the restricted version of the electronic book.

None of the cited art teaches or suggests at least the combination of the above-described features of amended Claim 1. For example, Duga describes that “a digital

content stored in one endian format at the virtual bookstore can be directly used by one group of viewing devices, but must be converted to a different endian format to be used by the other group.” Duga, at col. 1, lines 63-67. Moody allows each of more than one editor edits his own document copy using an editing application program; however, Moody fails to teach or suggest storing restricted version of the document. Dang does not disclose creating and saving a restricted version of the electronic book.

Accordingly, none of Duga, Moody, and Dang cures the deficiency of Handelman.

Therefore, the Applicant submits that amended Claim 1 is allowable over the cited art. Claims 10, 17, 25, 34, and 41 recite similar features to those recited in amended Claim 1. Therefore, amended Claims 10, 17, 25, 34, and 41 are also allowable over the cited art.

Claims 2-3, 6-9, 26-27, and 30-33, which depend on allowable independent Claims 1, 10, and 25, are likewise allowable at least for the reasons stated above and the additional features recited therein.

Further, Pajak and Walker fail to cure the deficiency of Handelman, Duga, Mody, and Dang. Therefore, amended Claim 12 is allowable over the cited art.

As amended Claim 36 recites similar features of amended Claim 12, for similar reasons, amended Claim 36 is also allowable over the cited art.

Claims 13-16 and 37-40, which depend on allowable independent Claims 12 and/or 36, are likewise allowable at least for the reasons stated above and their dependencies from allowable independent claims.

b. Independent Claim 50

The Applicant respectfully submits that nothing in the cited prior art, taken alone or in combination (not admitted), discloses or suggests a method for electronically displaying a page of an electronic book on a viewer and permitting a user to restrict content of the electronic book that comprises at least the combination of features of permitting the authorized user to request restriction of the identified content, wherein the restriction is stored in a header file of the electronic book, storing an unrestricted version of the electronic book including a restriction based on the identified content, the restricted version of the electronic book having a original content including restricted content, saving a restricted version of the electronic book, the restricted version including a portion of the original content and having the restricted content deleted without changing an original format of the electronic book, and inserting a cross reference between the restricted version and the unrestricted version of the electronic book in at least one of the restricted version and the unrestricted version of the electronic book, as recited in amended Claim 50.

As admitted in the Office Action, Huffman fails to teach or suggest indexing the electronic book within an index of the library unit and displaying a screen with the index having the electronic book, restricting access to electronic books displayed on a viewer, displaying an identification of an electronic book on a viewer, receiving identification information from a user, determining at the viewer if the user is authorized to restrict access to the electronic books. The Office Action, however, alleged that Duga, Handelman, Moody, and Dang teach such limitations.

Duga, Hanelman, Moody, and Dang fail to cure the deficiency of Huffman.


Therefore, amended Claim 50 is allowable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the claims now pending patentability distinguish the present invention from the cited references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into allowable form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 01-2300. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, with reference to Attorney Docket No. 026680-00029.

Respectfully submitted,


Wan-Ching Montfort
Registration No. 56,127

Customer No. 004372

1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Telephone No. (202) 857-6000
Facsimile No. (202) 857-6395